

Response to Official Action
Dated 3 July 2006
Re: USSN 10/759,390
Page 3

Drawing Amendment

Please replace sheets 1 and 2 of the drawing with the replacement sheets enclosed herewith. Figures 1 and 3 found on these sheets have been amended to include textual labels for the various features on these two figures as requested by the Examiner.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Official Action, the Examiner begins with a rejection under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph, asserting that Claims 1 and 4 are unclear. However, the Examiner misinterprets the scope of Claim 1 by re-reading the limitation mentioned at page 2 of the Official Action. There is nothing in Claim 1 to suggest any requirement that the data supplied to the remote profile database be scrambled and/or encrypted. The association that the Examiner makes between correct information and dummy information is incorrect and, indeed, inconsistent with the specification.

As the Examiner will note by reference to the amendments made to the claims herein, Claim 1 has been amended to recite "supply and correct information to the remote profile database to update the previously supplied dummy information with the correct information" and to also recite "after accessing the surface, supplying dummy information to the remote profile database to update the previously supplied correct information with dummy information". It is asserted that Claim 1, both as originally filed and as amended herein is utterly consistent with the disclosure. The limitation of Claims 1 and 4 do not contradict each other and therefore the rejection is without merit.

Indeed, the applicant is curious where the Examiner came up with the notion that the correct profile information has to be either scrambled and/or encrypted? The applicant would agree that this data can be scrambled or can be encrypted, but it is not believed that the disclosure requires it. As such, the reading of such a limitation into applicant's claims is quite improper particularly in view of

the fact that the patent statute gives the applicant the privilege of determining the scope of the claims. Please see 35 USC Section 112, Sixth Paragraph.

With respect to the drawing objection made by the Examiner, the Examiner will note that amended versions of Figures 1 and 3 are enclosed herewith which include textual labels of the features shown on those figures. With the entry of the drawing amendment, it is believed that the drawing objection falls away.

Turning now to the rejection under 35 USC 103, it is understood that the Examiner cited these references in view of the Examiner's misinterpretation of the scope of Claim 1.

It is believed that the claim as originally presented and the claims submitted herewith clearly distinguish themselves from the art cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner's discussion about encryption and scrambled data in the Official Action just has no particular relevance to either Claim 1 as originally presented or Claim 1 in its present form.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite "supply correct information to where a remote profile database to update the previously supplied dummy information with the correct information." With respect to the Examiner's discussion of dummy information in Felsher, Paragraphs 0247-0248, 0298-0299, does not meet that limitation. It is not seen how Muratani cited by the Examiner overcomes that deficiency.

In a somewhat similar vein, Claim 15 has been amended to recite "generate an update request to provide correct information to a remote profile database to update the previously supplied information stored at said remote profile database with said correct information." It is believed that amended Claim 15 is clearly distinguished from art cited by the Examiner.

A new Claim 21 has been added directed to a method of obfuscating user profile information stored on a remote profile system. Note that this claim recites, *inter alia*, "updating profile information of a particular user to reflect correct profile information regarding said particular user during a period of time when said particular user allows a third-party to access the user's correct profile information temporarily available on said remote system, after which the third-party access the profile information of the particular user is updated to comprise dummy information". It is not seen where art cited by the Examiner does that.

With the entry of this amendment, this application should now be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this

Response to Official Action
Dated 3 July 2006
Re: USSN 10/759,390
Page 12

response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

01 September 2006

(Date of Depositing)

Mary Ngo

(Name of Person Depositing)

[Signature]

(Signature)

01 September 2006

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Richard P. Berg

Attorney for the Applicant

Reg. No. 28,145

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard,

Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300 voice

(323) 934-0202 facsimile

Enclosure: Replacement Sheets 1/3 and 2/3

Postcard